

Application Serial No.: 10/023,556  
Corman et al.  
Response to Office Action mailed August 25, 2005

REMARKS

The Office Action objects to claims 16, 18, 37, and 39 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form. Applicants have amended claims 16, 18, 37, and 39 to place each in proper form. The Office Action further objects to claims 17-18 and 38-39 for containing informally written equations. Applicants have provided the equations in word processing format. Accordingly, the objections are believed to be overcome.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 28-29, 31-34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hearst. The Office Action further rejects claims 2, 9, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hearst in view of Budzinski.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a method for categorizing text comprising the steps of dividing the text into sentences, parsing the sentences into one or more noun phrases, converting the noun phrases into networks of word relationships by linking sequentially occurring noun phrases within each sentence, and analyzing the networks of word relationships to determine the influence of each word by utilizing betweenness centrality.

The Hearst reference at least does not teach or suggest converting the noun phrases into networks of word relationships by linking sequentially occurring noun phrases within each sentence, and analyzing the networks of word relationships to determine the influence of each word by utilizing betweenness centrality. Hearst does not teach utilizing betweenness centrality as contemplated in Applicants' specification, see

Application Serial No.: 10/023,556

Corman et al.

Response to Office Action mailed August 25, 2005

page 11, line 6 through page 13, line 4. Hearst does not teach any linking through sequentially occurring noun phrases within each sentence. Contrary to the statement in the Office Action, Applicants submit that Hearst makes no such disclosure.

Therefore, claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over the Hearst reference. Claims 2-3, 5, and 36 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

Applicants have amended claim 7 as per the Examiner's helpful suggestion to include limitation of the base claim. Claim 7 should be in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended claim 8 to recite a method for analyzing text comprising the steps of dividing the text into sentences, parsing the sentences into one or more noun phrases, converting one or more words within each of the noun phrases into networks of relationships between words, analyzing the networks to determine the influence for each word by utilizing betweenness centrality, and applying the analyzed networks to perform a specific analysis task.

The Hearst reference at least does not teach or suggest analyzing the networks to determine the influence for each word by utilizing betweenness centrality. Hearst does not utilize betweenness centrality as contemplated in Applicants' specification, see page 11, line 6 through page 13, line 4.

Therefore, claim 8 is believed to patentably distinguish over the Hearst reference. Claims 9-12 and 14-15 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

Applicants have amended claims 16 and 18 as per the Examiner's helpful suggestion to place the claims in proper

Application Serial No.: 10/023,556  
Corman *et al.*  
Response to Office Action mailed August 25, 2005

independent form. Claims 16-27 should be in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended claim 28 to recite a method for analyzing text comprising the steps of compartmentalizing the text into defined units, categorizing the defined units by parsing the units into one or more noun phrases each comprising one or more words, converting the word or words into networks of relationships between words by linking sequentially occurring noun phrases within a defined unit, and analyzing the networks of word associations to determine the structural influence of each word by utilizing betweenness centrality, and applying the analyzed network to perform a specific analysis task.

The Hearst reference at least does not teach or suggest converting the word or words into networks of relationships between words by linking sequentially occurring noun phrases within a defined unit, and analyzing the networks of word associations to determine the structural influence of each word by utilizing betweenness centrality. Hearst does not teach linking through sequentially occurring noun phrases within the defined unit, nor does Hearst utilize betweenness centrality as contemplated in Applicants' specification, see page 11, line 6 through page 13, line 4.

Therefore, claim 28 is believed to patentably distinguish over the Hearst reference. Claims 29-31, 33, and 35 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

Applicants have amended claims 37 and 39 as per the Examiner's helpful suggestion to place the claims in proper independent form. Claims 37-48 should be in condition for allowance.

Application Serial No.: 10/023,556

Corman et al.

Response to Office Action mailed August 25, 2005

Applicant(s) believe that all information and requirements for the application have been provided to the USPTO. If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of the Application, Applicant(s) invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due with this Response to U.S. PTO Account No. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,  
QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG LLP

November 25, 2005

By: 

Robert D. Atkins  
Reg. No. 34,288

Address all correspondence to:

**Robert D. Atkins**

Quarles & Brady Streich Lang LLP

One Renaissance Square

Two North Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Telephone: (602) 229-5311

Facsimile: (602) 229-5690

E-mail: rda@quarles.com